UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/636,102	08/10/2000	Daniel O. Ramos	60259	6353

		EXAMINER
23735 7590 01/21/2004		VU, THANH T

DIGIMARC CORPORATION
19801 SW 72ND AVENUE
SUITE 100
TUALATIN, OR 97062

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment B, Filed 10/22/03.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-10, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Houser et al. ("Houser", U.S. Pat. No. 5,606,609).

Per claim 1, Houser teaches a file browser system comprising:

a file browser for displaying in a user interface a representation of media object files

stored in memory (fig. 4B; col. 11, lines 11-34); and

a file browser extension for decoding an object identifier from a selected media object

file and for displaying in an extension of the user interface metadata or an action associated with

the media object file via the object identifier (Fig. 8; col. 15, lines 45-68).

Per claim 2, Houser teaches the file browser system of claim 1 wherein the object

identifier is decoded from a watermark embedded in the selected media object file (fig. 8; col. 4,

lines 3-10; col. 16, lines 52-67).

Per claim 3, Houser teaches the file browser system of claim 1 wherein the file browser

extension displays the metadata or action in a context menu extension of the user interface of the

file browser (col. 16, lines 34-50).

Per claim 4, Houser teaches the file browser system of claim 1 wherein the file browser displays the metadata or action in a property page extension of the user interface of the file browser (col. 16, lines 34-50).

Per claim 5, Houser teaches the file browser system of claim 1 wherein the file browser extension forwards the object identifier to a metadata server, and displays metadata or an action returned from the server (Fig. 1; element 140; col. 15, lines 25-35).

Per claim 6, Houser teaches the file browser system of claim 5 wherein the file browser extension extracts and displays metadata from the media object file along with metadata returned from the metadata server (Fig. 1; element 140; col. 15, lines 25-35).

Per claim 7, Houser teaches the file browser of claim 1 wherein the metadata or action is displayed as a URL link to information or a program associated with the selected media object file (col. 16, lines 34-51; col. 17, lines 33-48).

Per claim 8, Houser teaches a file browser system comprising:

file browser for displaying in a user interface media object files stored in memory (fig. 4B; col. 11, lines 11-34); and

a file browser extension for encoding an object identifier into a selected media object file and for displaying in an extension of the user interface one or more options for enabling a user to enter input to control the encoding of the object identifier (fig. 6; col. 13, lines 20-35; col. 14, lines 1-10).

Per claim 9, Houser teaches the method claim 8 wherein the file browser extension comprises a watermark encoder for encoding the object identifier into the selected media object file (col. 4, lines 55-69; col. 8, lines 20-33).

Per claim 10, Houser teaches a watermark decoder system comprising:

a host application having a user interface for displaying a representation of media object files (fig. 8; col. 15, lines 25-31 and lines 45-54); and an extension to the host application for decoding a watermark from a selected media object file and for displaying in an extension of the user interface metadata or an action associated with the media object file via the watermark (Fig. 8; col. 16, lines 34-50; col. 17, lines 32-48).

Per claim 14, Houser teaches a method of rendering a media object comprising:

decoding an object identifier from the media object (fig. 8; col. 15, lines 54-67);

sending the object identifier to a metadata server (fig. 1; element 140; col. 15, lines 25-35);

receiving a brand identifier from the metadata server and displaying a representation of the brand identifier (col. 16, lines 34-50).

Per claim 15, Houser teaches the method of claim 14 wherein the object identifier is decoded from a watermark embedded in the media object (fig. 8; col. 4, lines 3-10; col. 16, lines 52-67).

Per claim 16, Houser teaches the method of claim 14 wherein the media object is a video or an image, and the representation of the brand identifier is a graphic superimposed on a rendering of the video or image (col. 17, lines 5-13; col. 18, lines 57-67).

Per claim 17, Houser teaches the method of claim 16 wherein the graphic is a hot link to information or an action associated with the media object (col. 19, lines 18-37).

Per claim 18, Houser teaches the method of claim 17 wherein selecting the hot link

causes retrieval of the information or action from a remote server (col. 18, line 58-col. 19, line

10).

Per claim 19, Houser teaches a method for extending a user interface of a media player

comprising:

in response to input requesting playback of a media object, extracting an object identifier

from the media object (col. 11, lines 52-61); using the object identifier to look up metadata

associated with the media object (fig. 8; col. 15, lines 45-67); extending a user interface of a

media player to include a representation of the metadata associated with the media object (col.

16, lines 34-50).

Per claim 20, Houser teaches the method of claim 19 wherein extracting the object

identifier includes decoding the object identifier from a watermark embedded in the media object

(fig. 8; col. 4, lines 3-10; col. 16, lines 52-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ("Houser",

U.S. Pat. No. 5,606,609) in view of Huntsman (U.S. Pat. No. 5,801,689).

Per claim 11, Houser teaches a browser on a computer readable medium, the browser

comprising: a listener program for identifying a media object in an document (fig. 8; interpreter

module 250; col. 15, lines 25-27); and for inserting a handler into the document when an object

identifier is extracted from the media object (col. 16, lines 52-67); wherein the handler is

operable to display metadata linked via the object identifier in response to user input (col. 19,

lines 17-26), but does not teach the browser is an internet browser. However, Huntsman teaches

an Internet browser (col. 4, lines 20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Huntsman in the invention of

Houser in order to provide a means for accessing the document information from a remote

location.

Per claim 12, Houser teaches the internet browser of claim 11 wherein the object

identifier is decoded from a watermark embedded in the media object (col. 4, lines 51-54).

Per claim 13, Houser teaches the internet browser of claim 11 wherein the metadata is

retrieved from a metadata server by sending the object identifier to the metadata server (fig. 1;

element 140).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Amendment B have been considered but are moot

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (703)-308-9119. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

T. Vu
01/07/04

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100